



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

incident to the application of the referendum," and thus reduce the necessity for resort to the referendum.

There was little active opposition to the measure. But the objection was made that congestion of business in the legislature would be increased by its adoption through the natural tendency to give tentative approval to anything submitted at the first period, since final action was reserved for the second; that the expense of legislation would be increased through double mileage and otherwise; that there was no chance for emergency measures at the second period; that the large majority required for amendments would establish a dictatorship of the small minority; that members would be busy with their private affairs during the interim and would give no time to public discussion of legislation; that if they did give up their time to such action the cost of their "campaign" would be great; that anyway the people would not avail themselves of opportunity afforded for acquaintance with proposed legislation; that "special interests" would benefit from the increased opportunities for "lobbying" with individual members of the legislature, to the detriment of the public interests.

Perhaps confusion caused by conflicting measures accounts for the defeat of the proposition as much as anything else, unless the general tendency to vote against everything at the election, good, bad, and indifferent. In fact only one of the eleven measures submitted was approved by the voters.

JAMES D. BARNETT.

University of Oregon.

Compulsory Voting in Oregon. For many years, in Oregon, as elsewhere, "the apathy of the voters," "the waning interest in elections," has been the cause of lamentation, and, as elsewhere, various remedies for this evil have been suggested. "Statesmen are groping for a plan to cure the non-voting habit, because they realize that non-voting is at the bottom of many governmental ills." Especially since 1913 some penalty for failure to vote has been urged. Something like a "compulsory voting" act was passed by the legislature in 1915, providing, as it does, that one who fails to vote at least once in two years cannot vote again without going to the trouble involved in reregistration or in "swearing in" his vote at the election. The legislature of 1919 submitted a constitutional amendment to the voters empowering the legislature to provide for both compulsory registration and compulsory voting, but the measure was defeated by a large majority at

the election of 1920. Fines or temporary disfranchisement were the penalties generally anticipated.

"Were it possible to drag everybody to the polls, no way is possible to prevent the deposit of blank ballots by those who do not wish to vote." The proposal seemed to contain "much of the ancient proposition of compulsory drinking by the horse, after leading him to the unappreciated trough." The contrary view, however, appears to be more in accord with the facts. "It is a peculiarity of humankind that duty is often shirked, but when driven to it the shirkers make good more often than not." It is so with other affairs in life. Why is it not so with the ballot? But it was contended that nothing is to be gained by driving the "shirkers" to act. Failure to vote is due to indifference as to results, and as a rule this indifference is the product of ignorance of issues. There is nothing gained by compelling men and women to help arbitrate issues of which they have no understanding. However, there is certainly at least as much reason for the opposite view. "The stay-at-homes as a rule lack neither intelligence nor morals. They are usually either indolent or thoughtless. It is not just the vicious who refuse to vote, but those who do not take their franchise rights seriously, those who permit others to run the government, and then spend their spare moments protesting because it is not run to suit them. The votes of many of these people are worth getting." To whatever extent the public may generally have been influenced by such considerations, certainly the main reason for the defeat of the proposal was the invasion of personal liberty believed to be involved. "Compulsory voting without police espionage is wholly impracticable." "Who wants to be herded to the polls by the police?" In view of current events, it is very significant that the measure was endorsed by organized labor.

Two "admirable substitutes" for compulsory voting have been advocated—decrease in the frequency of elections and in the length of the ballot. These have, however, received but little favor.

JAMES D. BARNETT.

University of Oregon.